

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/600,260

Applicant(s)

YU ET AL.

Examiner

Lawrence W. Luk

Art Unit

2187

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 March 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-20 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawing Figure 3 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83 (a) because they fail to show a **spring-loaded tray 64 coupled to a lever 66** in the drawing, refer to page 7 line 13 of the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP 608.02 (d). correction is required.

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83 (a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the **electronic circuit 18**, and **spring** must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Brief description of the drawings fail to address **Figure 1A**.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2187

5. Claims 1, 3, 6-11 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osawa et al. (6,764,373) in view of Sengupta et al. (6,320,354).

Claim 1

As to claim 1, Osawa et al. disclose in figure 13-16, a battery charger amusement device comprising: a battery charger having a receptacle adapted to receive a rechargeable battery, the battery having a charge status **(see column 5, lines 42-50)**; an electronic circuit monitoring charge status **(see column 18, lines 38-46)**; a mechanical movement signal activated upon the battery attaining a preselected charge status as measured by said electronic circuits **(see column 18, lines 5-30)**, but fails to teach a **second electronic circuit communicating information to a user independent of charge status prior to the battery attaining the preselected charge status.**

Sengupta et al. disclose in column 3, lines 4-9, a second electronic circuit communicating information to a user independent of charge status prior to the battery attaining the preselected charge status.

Osawa et al. and Sengupta et al. are analogous art because they are from same field of endeavor battery charging system.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a second electronic circuit communicating information to a user independent of charge status prior to the battery attaining the preselected charge status.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provides a technique that solves the problem of determining a battery's level during charging without the requirement for precise current monitoring or control. (see column 2, lines 46-48 of Sengupta et al.)

Therefore, It would have been obvious to combine Sengupta et al. with Osawa et al. for the battery charge status prior to the battery attaining the preselected charge status.

Claim 3

As to claim 3, Osawa et al. in view of Sengupta et al. are applied supra, and Osawa et al. further disclose in figure 4, further comprising an AC coupler. **(see column 2, lines 34).**

Claim 6

As to claim 6, Osawa et al. in view of Sengupta et al. are applied supra, and Osawa et al. further disclose the information is of a type selected from the group consisting of language, text, music, light, movement and video. **(see column 4, lines 37-39, lines 56-65 and column 3, line 66 to column 4, line 4).**

Claim 7

As to claim 7, Osawa et al. in view of Sengupta et al. are applied supra, and Osawa et al. further disclose in figure 16, further comprising a housing **(unit 80-3).**

Claim 8

As to claim 8, Osawa et al. in view of Sengupta et al. are applied supra, and Osawa et al. further discloses **in column 11, lines 18-31**, wherein said mechanical

Art Unit: 2187

movement signal is selected from a group consisting of: release of a spring, activation of an electric drive motor to create a mechanical movement, deactivation of said electrical motor, and movement of a liquid or powder.

Claim 9

As to claim 9, Osawa et al. in view of Sengupta et al. are applied supra, and Osawa et al. further disclose **in column 1, line 58 to column 2, line 3**, said housing is configured in a form selected from the group consisting of humanoid, animate, vehicular and natural.

Claim 10

As to claim 10, Osawa et al. in view of Sengupta et al. are applied supra, and Osawa et al. further disclose **in column 4, lines 56-65**, further comprising a light.

Claim 11

As to claim 11, Osawa et al. in view of Sengupta et al. are applied supra, and Osawa et al. further disclose in **figure 4**, further comprising a user input interface to said electronic circuit.

Claim 20

As to claim 20, Osawa et al. in view of Sengupta et al. are applied supra, and Osawa et al. further disclose in figure 13-16, a process for charging a battery comprising: receiving a mechanical movement signal from said device indicating charge status of the battery (**see column 4, lines 37-46**); and removing the battery from said device after the charging duration. (**see column 3, lines 38-42**).

Art Unit: 2187

6. Claims 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osawa et al. (6,764,373) in view of Chen et al. (6,384,575).

Claim 12

As to claim 12, Osawa et al. disclose in figure 14-16, a battery charger amusement device comprising: in column 5, lines 42-50, a battery charger having a receptacle adapted to receive a rechargeable battery, the battery having a charge status (**see column 5, lines 42-50**); an electronic circuit activated by the rechargeable battery being inserted into the receptacle, said electronic circuit monitoring charge status (**see column 18, lines 38-46**), but fails to teach **a spring compressed by the rechargeable battery being inserted into the receptacle; and a spring release triggered by said electronic circuit in response to the charge status of the battery.**

Chen et al. disclose in figure 1b, column 1, lines 35-62, a spring (**unit 16**) compressed by the rechargeable battery being inserted into the receptacle (**unit 12**); and a spring (**unit 16**) release triggered by said electronic circuit in response to the charge status of the battery.

Osawa et al. and Chen et al. are analogous art because they are from same field of endeavor of battery charging system.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a spring compressed by the rechargeable battery being inserted into the receptacle; and a spring release triggered by said electronic circuit in response to the charge status of the battery.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provides an improved battery charger capable of charging different size of batteries.

Therefore, It would have been obvious to combine Chen et al. with Osawa et al. for the battery receptacle to be a concave recess having multiple supporting surfaces.

Claim 13

As to claim 13, Osawa et al. in view of Chen et al. are applied supra, and Osawa et al. further disclose in figure 4, further comprising an AC coupler.(see column 2, line 34).

Claim 14

As to claim 14, Osawa et al. in view of Chen et al. are applied supra, and Chen et al. further disclose the battery is selected from a group consisting of: AAA, AA, B, C, D and 9 volt. (see column 1, lines 20-34).

Claim 15

As to claim 15, Osawa et al. in view of Chen et al. are applied supra, and Osawa et al. further disclose in figure 16, further comprising a housing (unit 80-3).

Claim 16

As to claim 16, Osawa et al. in view of Chen et al. are applied supra, and Osawa et al. further disclose the housing is configured in a form selected from the group consisting of an appliance, a jack-in-the-box, and a figurine.(see column 11, lines 18-32).

Art Unit: 2187

Claim 17

As to claim 17, Osawa et al. in view of Chen et al. are applied supra, and Osawa et al. further disclose in **column 4, lines 56-65**, further comprising a light.

Claim 18

As to claim 18, Osawa et al. in view of Chen et al. are applied supra, and Osawa et al. further disclose further comprising a second electronic communicating information independent of charge status. **(see column 18, lines 47-52).**

7. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osawa et al. (6,764,373) in view of Sengupta et al. (6,320,354) as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Miller et al. (5,818,197).

Claim 5

As to claim 5, Osawa et al. in view of Sengupta et al. discloses the elements as claimed, except for **said electronic circuit further comprises a microprocessor.**

Miller et al. disclose in column 6, lines 29-31, said electronic circuit further comprises a microprocessor.

Osawa et al., Sengupta et al. and Miller et al. are analogous art because they are from same field of endeavor of battery charging systems.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include an electronic circuit further comprising a microprocessor.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provides a versatile and adaptive charging device for charging various types of batteries and battery packs. (see column 2, lines 65-67).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to combine Miller et al. with Osawa et al. and Sengupta et al. to provide a universal charger interface which is adaptable for connection to various types of battery interfaces.

Claim 4

As to claim 4, Osawa et al., Sengupta in view of Miller et al. are applied supra, and Miller et al. further disclose the battery is selected from a group consisting of: AAA, AA, B, C, D and 9 volt. **(see column 1, line 16).**

8. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osawa et al. (6,764,373) in view of Matsuda (5,506,749).

Claim 19

As to claim 19, Osawa et al. discloses the elements as claimed, except for further comprising a battery caddy electrically intermediate between the battery and said receptacle.

Matsuda disclose in figure 1, column 5, lines 34-43, the battery case (unit 17) has a size and shape which are virtually identical to those of the battery receptacle.

Osawa et al. and Matsuda are analogous art because they are from same field of endeavor of battery charging systems.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the battery case having a size and shape which are virtually identical to those of the battery receptacle.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a battery pack having a large power storage capacity that is continuously used for a long time. (see the paragraph bridging column 1 and 2).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to combine Matsuda with Osawa et al. to include the battery case having a size and shape which are virtually identical to those of the battery receptacle as taught by Matsuda for attaching the battery pack to the housing.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lawrence W. Luk whose telephone number is 571-272-2080. The examiner can normally be reached on 7 a.m. to 5 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Donald Sparks can be reached on (571) 272-4201. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2187

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LWL

August 18, 2005

Lawrence Auk

examiner

8/18/05